DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 346 EA 011 720

AUTHOR Di Bella, Cecilia M.
TITLE System Constraints on Prospective Women Administrators.
PUB DATE 12 Apr 79
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979); Not available in paper copy due to light print of original document

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Career Development; *Educational Administration; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Females; *Sex Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS *Womens Educational Equity Act

ABSTRACT

This paper assesses the positive and negative impacts of the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974 and discusses the potential of the act for promoting access and entry for prospective women administrators. It briefly reviews the purpose and intent of the women's equity legislation and offers a summary of projects funded to promote the advancement of women into educational leadership. Also discussed are some of the constraints that continue to confront prospective women administrators including sexism, the lack of turnover in administrative positions, and inherent deficiencies in the women's equity approach. The paper concludes that the federal government can take steps to remedy decreased opportunities for women if it so desires and directs. Also, commitment and action to resolve the constraints must be the shared responsibility of a variety of groups, individuals, and governmental agencies. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED172346

SYSTEM CONSTRAINTS ON PROSPECTIVE WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS

A Paper Presented to the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco
April 12, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. D. Bella

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Dr. Cecilia M. Di Bella
Massachusetts Department
of Education

EA 011 720

INTRODUCTION

This presentation will examine the Women's Equity intervention from the perspective of current national, state and local issues, trends, and developments which constrain equity for women in educational administration. Recent data reveal that the number of women in administrative positions in school districts has actually declined since the enactment of the Women's Educational Equity Act in 1974. This distressing development is further compounded by the fact that women's representation in administrative categories continues to decline, and in some cases, at an alarming rate. There is, however, evidence which suggests that some of the factors and obstacles associated with women's low status in education are diminishing. These factors include: the number of women receiving doctoral degrees in educational administration, increased mobility, increased levels of aspiration and attention to career planning. Furthermore, new categories of federal funds for state and local projects now provide more opportunities -- albeit short-term ones, for women to gain valuable administrative skills and experience. The bottom-line of this discussion, however, still rests on the numbers game; and clearly, the women's equity "number" has poorer and weaker odds each year.

The title of this presentation may suggest a foregone conclusion -- that is a preponderance of factors continues to limit, rather than promote equity for women in spite of federal interventions. Educators and policy-makers on the federal level may interpret this statement as a negative point of view since it appears to downgrade the positive and powerful impact of federal interventions in stimulating and supporting educational change. This is not the intention here, for this author's previous research on this topic documented the powerful force of federal interventions in education.[1] However, the factors and conditions

governing educational administration for women are very different, and prospective women administrators must be cognizant of the shifting and counteracting forces in today's educational enterprise which affect their career planning and development. Furthermore, given the "bottom-line" data on the number of women in administration, federal policy-makers must honestly assess whether the Women's Equity "intervention" as presently constituted, can really overcome or even address the particular problems and trends that continue to make equity for women an illusion in American education.

Today, women's aspirations and their attempts to gain access and entry into administrative circles are tempered, if not undermined, by a variety of conflicting and contradictory pressure points. While federal regulations and interventions appear to promote equity for women, the means by which access and entry are offered belies the reality of current employment patterns and trends. On one hand, an increasing supply of qualified, experienced and credentialled women is available for administrative positions but a decreasing demand for administrators still leaves women outside administrative circles. Thus, the treatment for women's underrepresentation in educational administration still does not allow women access, entry, or acceptance into administration.

Employment is not the only area where the real issues related to access and entry for women are systematically avoided. Sexism, delicately transformed into a blame-the-victim motif, is still a pervasive characteristic of educational administration. Moreover, research activities related to women in educational administration often bear the scars of sexist or biased treatment.

These constraints -- supply and demand for administrators, the pervasive effects of sexism, and the inherent deficiencies in the Women's

Equity approach to promoting access and entry for prospective women administrators, continue to counteract whatever positive results may accrue from intervention efforts such as the Boston University Women's Equity module. This paper will examine these positive and negative forces, and assess the utility and potential impact of Women's Equity as a federal intervention for prospective women administrators in light of these constraints. A brief review of the purposes and intents of the Women's Equity legislation, and a summary of projects funded to promote the advancement of women in educational leadership during the first two funding cycles are a useful framework for examining the constraints that continue to confront prospective women administrators.

I. P.L. 93-380, Section 408, Women's Educational Equity

In the early 1970's pressure by women's groups across the country stimulated a Congressional examination of the status of women in American education. Not surprisingly, Congress found that "educational programs in the United States, as presently conducted are frequently inequitable as such programs relate to women, and frequently limit the full participation of all individuals in American society." This conclusion led to the enactment of the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974 with its stated purpose "to promote equity for women in the United States."

Federal regulations governing the administration of Women's Equity established three priority areas for funding:

A. modules on sexism in education
B. programs for educational leadership
C. program development related to career preparation

Cognizant of the depth of the problem of equity for women and the limited budget available to promote equity, the First Annual Report of Women's Equity notes that:

> A catalytic effect is anticipated as a result of the employment of a capacity-building strategy to extend the impact ofeach project beyond the local to the national level.[2]

During Year I, sixty-seven projects, twenty-two in category A, eleven in category B, and twenty-three in category C were funded.[3] In addition eleven small grants were awarded. Of the eleven projects in category B, educational leadership, one project focused on higher education administrators, one focused on medical school administration, one sought to expand women's career options in agricultural education, and two concentrated on vocational administrators and counselors. Only two projects, the five-part University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) grant and a Leadership Training Project in Texas targeted primarily on educational leadership in elementary and secondary education.

This breakdown is provided to highlight the interest, commitment, and concern of program developers about the problem in sex segregation in school leadership. It is not intended to reflect upon proposal reviewers or the funding agency. However, it bears noticing that of the $4.6 million allocated for Year I programs, fourteen percent of the funds ($639,574) were devoted to the problems of women in administration, in areas such as agriculture, medicine, vocational education, counseling and higher education. However, only 4.4% of the $4.6 million or $204,098, specifically addressed the problems, issues or concerns confronting prospective women administrators in elementary and secondary education.

Funding categories and priorities were revised for Year II of Women's Equity. The Second Annual Report states that the "priority areas were eliminated". The term "capacity-building" also disappeared and Women's Equity turned its attention to the development of products and model programs. One further clarification mentioned in the Annual Report is also noteworthy:

> The achievement of equity does not imply the development of a new stereotype for women, nor for men. Rather, the program emphasizes the availability of choices or options, so that educational programs can become truly equitable.[4]

This presentation is not intended to investigate the reasons behind this shift in emphasis and direction. However, the Second Annual Report intimates that concern about the perceived or actual impact of Women's Equity, either positively or negatively, by either men, women, supporters, or non-supporters, was brewing somewhere. Regardless of where this tempest was brewing,the result was that the funding categories expanded to six:

1. development of educational materials
2. pre- and in-service education
3. research and development
4. guidance and counseling
5. adult women
6. adult education, career education, physical education, educational administration

Little analysis is needed to determine that "educational leadership" as a priority for funding, or as an equity concern was drastically reduced. Only seven of the thirty-nine new grants were in the sixth category. Of these seven, only two focused on women in educational leadership. One small grant was designed to "raise women's career aspirations". Thus, of the $2.88 million granted in new awards in Year II of Women's Equity, only 8.8% or $255,846 focused on women in educational leadership.

Dollar amounts and numbers of projects funded alone cannot measure the impact of the Women's Equity in its short three-year existence. It is distressing, however, that less than 6.1% of the projects funded by Women's Equity during Years I and II focused on promoting educational leadership for prospective women administrators. The major obstacles facing women aspiring to careers in educational administration such as the lack of qualified, credentialled women; low levels of aspiration; conflicting personal and professional goals and so on; are well known and need not be discussed here. Recent studies provide some optimistic signs that the direct impact or ripple effect of Women's Equity, Title IX and other equity efforts are making a significant contribution toward reducing the effect of these obstacles. However, given the constraints to equity produced by the educational system, and the economy of the seventies, these positive indicators that enhance access, fall far short in providing women entry or acceptance in administration. The "numbers game" or tally of women in administrative positions unfor-

tunately provides the most accurate measure of the impact of equity efforts. A brief summary of this data, a review of some stresses, strains, and positive indicators of progress, and an analysis of the "intervention" itself, are convincing testimony to the discrepancy between Congressional intent and Congressional commitment to equity for women. [6]

II. Women in Educational Leadership 1928-1978

Despite heightened awareness about the problem, current intervention activities, and widespread efforts to increase the number of women in educational administration, the actual number of women administrators has declined since the enactment of the Women's Equity Act in 1974.[7]

The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) reports that women constituted only 11% of the total number of principals in the United States in 1976 -- the lowest representation of women principals in the history of American education. Table 1, a compilation of data from the National Education Association (NEA),National Elementary (NAESP) and Secondary School Principals (NASSP) shows the alarming decrease in the number of women principals on all levels.[8]

Table 1

Percentage of Women Principals 1928-1978

	1928	1948	1958	1964	1968	1971	1973	1974	1978
Elementary	55	41	38	-	22	21	19	-	18
Jr. H.S.	-	15	9	4	-	-	-	1.4	-
H.S.	-	-	-	10	-	3	1.4	-	-

Source: NEA, NASSP, NAESP

Data on the percentage of women superintendents, Table 2 are equally dismal.

Table 2

Percentage of Women Superintendents 1970-1978

1970	1974	1975*	1976*	1977	1978
1	.9	(4)	(4)	-	.4

*NCES data combines Superintendents and Asst. Supts.

Source: NCES, NEA, AASA (American Association of School Administrators)

Gaps and discrepancies in data collection by federal agencies and professional associations make the simplest accounting measures difficult, frustrating, and inaccurate. In spite of this problem, it is apparent that the greatest decline in the number of women superintendents has occured since the enactment of Women's Equity in 1974. One must ask, then, whether Women's Equity has actually produced a backlash against the entry and acceptance of women into administration.

Given these dismal figures, what obstacles and opportunities can prospective women administrators expect in their quest for entry, mid and upper level administrative positions in education? Again, the "good news" hardly measures up against the bad news. A variety of constraints on the total educational system on the federal, state and local levels will have a particularly severe impact on the advancement of women administrators despite positive changes in women's personal and professional "readiness" for administration. These system constraints, termed in this fashion because they are endemic to the total educational system and the economy, require major, not piecemeal intervention measures to truly and effectively address the problems confronting prospective women administrators. This conundrum complicates and confuses women's efforts for as they achieve the requirements and conditions that enchance entry and access into administration, new constraints and old patterns of entrenched sexism deny or block the acceptance of women into administration. A discussion of these conflicting forces brings the limitations of Women's Equity as a federal intervention into sharper focus.

III. Increased Readiness and Decreased Entry: The Dilemma for Prospective Women Administrators

Supply and Demand for Women Administrators

The effect of the law of supply and demand in today's job market is a major constraint on women's attempts to enter educational administration. This is particularly problematic today because increased numbers of women are now qualified, experienced, credentialled, and ready to advance into administration. In recent years the "pool" or number of qualified women has often been cited as a major deterrent for women.

A widespread explanation for the low number of women administrators is the small number of women earning doctoral degrees in educational administration in comparison with their representation in education. The number of degrees in educational administration conferred on women decreased between 1960 and 1970 but recent data show an increase in the number and percentage of successful women doctoral candidates.[9] Furthermore, projections of the number of earned degrees in education in 1985 made by the National Center for Educational Statistics indicate the gap between male and female advanced degree recipients will continue to narrow.

Table 3

Earned Doctorates in Educational Administration

1971-1977

	1971	1974	1977
Total Degrees	1534	1401	1510
Male Recipients	1442	1239	1182
Percentage	94%	88%	78%
Female Recipients	92	162	328
Percentage	6%	11%	21%

Source: National Research Council, Summary Report of Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities [illegible]

Analysis of this data can lead in several directions. One could hypothesize that in the future educational administrators will be trained in business or law schools, not schools of education and therefore men are vacating their places in educational administration programs. Similarly, it may be argued that today there is less reliance on the doctorate as a requirement for an administrative position, and more reliance on the career ladder. Men dominate women on every rung of the career ladder beyond the classroom, and women are simply outnumbered by male mobility and experience. Whatever the analysis says or means, the good news is that there are now a greater supply of women doctors in education than ever before, and the issue of the doctorate as an obstacle for women is no longer valid.

Women's so-called "low levels of aspiration" are frequently cited as a major cause of women's poor representation in administration. A 1975 survey of Oregon school administrators, 99.9% male, found that women simply did not want to become school administrators. Furthermore, the superintendents claimed that the public did not want and would not accept women administrators. Yet a survey of over 800 Oregon adults conducted just two years later found that 84% approved of women as high school principals and86% supported women as superintendents. This contrast of perceived and actual attitudes towards women administrators smacks of deflected bias that would lower anyone's aspirations! In Oregon, school boards and administrators clearly over-estimated public resistance to women administrators.

Coffin and Ekstrom (1977) also examined the issues of women's career aspirations. Their survey of women administrators found that specificity of aspirations was an important indicator of goal attainment in professional advancement. Furthermore, women with very specific career aspirations

showed a greater frequency in applying for jobs. This finding should diminish the discouragement and self-doubt of prospective women administrators produced by unsuccessful job applications. More importantly, this finding reinforces the need for women to concentrate on short and long-term career planning -- noted as one of the most significant impacts of the Boston University module.

Survey results from the participants in the Boston University Women's Equity module (Apostolon, 1979) highlight the positive impact of the module on women's career planning and action steps toward fulfilling career aspirations.

These results demonstrate recent successes in expanding the pool of qualified women. However, this rosy picture quickly fades when the current constraints on the demand for school administrators are considered. Declining enrollments, reductions-in-force, and school district consolidation are a harsh fact of life in a majority of school districts across the country.

The National Center for Educational Statistics reports a 39% decrease in the number of school districts nationally from 1965 to 1975.[10] Berman and McLaughlin (1978) assert that supply and demand adjustments are felt more strongly in administration since positions such as assistant or vice-principal that are the stepping stones to principalships are the first to disappear. Central office "special services" or "specialty" positions are equally vulnerable.[11] Thus, career advancement becomes more problematic as opportunities for entry level positions decrease. Moreover, job mobility becomes severely restricted during periods of decline since there is less turnover of administrative personnel on all rungs of the career ladder as administrators remain in their positions for longer periods of time.

Periods of educational expansion during the sixties and seventies allowed greater and more diverse expectations for career goals for educators. Conversely, sustained periods of decline and retrenchment close the doors on these traditional routes to administration. This is especially acute for those segments of the population such as women and minorities who are outside the system and barely on the ladder. Blocked career paths are not the only damage wrought by decline and retrenchment, however. Social behaviorists point out that blocking upward mobility decreases the motivation and increases the frustration of school staff which ultimately affect school climate.[12]

Educational Administration Catches "the Fever"

As if the impact of declining enrollments didn't decrease the demand for women administrators severely enough, a new virus called "proposition fever" has suddenly infected the country. This development further restricts access and entry for prospective women administrators. Within months of the enactment of Proposition 13, legislators and gubernatorial candidates promising tax relief for property owners swept into office in November, 1978 on the heels of the epidemic. Education in general, and prospective women administrators in particular, will suffer dire results.

Under proposition 13-type legislation, the remedy for taxes, is simply less governmental spending. "Caps" or limits on local budgets have a direct impact on schools since educational expenditures constitute approximately 50-75% of local budgets. In Massachusetts, and other states, the autonomy of local school districts will be endangered under this simplistic solution to property tax relief. In fact, the solution which is geared toward solving everyone's problem will probably serve none of the real societal problems facing property-owners and tenants alike.

"Proposition fever" only serves to push the real issues of societal choices and values aside. For example, discussions about quality education, already endangered by declining enrollments, are increasingly rare as reduced school expenditures and basic skills become major topics. Similarly, entry-level positions that are critical opportunities for prospective women administrators, will gradually disappear, closing off an important rung on the career ladder.

"Caps" on state and federal budgets will produce similar results in other segments of the educational enterprise. Decreased state and federal funds to state departments of education mean that promotional opportunities, particularly in the mid and upper-level administrative levels decrease. This is particularly harmful to women and minorities who have benefited from recent expansion in federal education priorities that provided new administrative positions. Many of these positions were filled by women and minorities and served to compensate for male domination in administrative positions in state education agencies. In many state and local departments of education short-term, 2-5 year federal projects provide new career paths and options for women and minorities. These project directors, in areas such as gifted and talented education, community education and women's equity form a cadre of experienced mid-level administrators who will be the victims of decreased federal funding. The dilemma of these so-called soft-money administrators in state and local education agencies is complex since tranfer of these project functions and services from federal to state or local monies is improbable in light of decreased budgets. Moreover, ESEA Title V funds to state departments of education which traditionally supported these federal programs following the expiration of these grants, were drastically reduced in FY'79.[13] This development adds further con-

straints to an already stress-laden structure.

The availability of increased amounts of federal funds to state departments of education has had a dramatic impact on the expansion of state agencies. A recent study of the impact of federal funds on educational change efforts in the Rhode Island Department of Education (DiBella, 1978)noted a pattern of heavy reliance on federal funds, particularly ESEA Title V, in early stages of development and innovation with gradual transfer to state funds or so-called "hard-money". A typical state department of education will show a small percentage of women in the top level state-funded positions, and a larger percentage of women in federally-funded soft-money project director positions that constitute initial mid-level positions in these organizations. The dilemma of women soft-money managers may well shift these scales again.

There are, however, a few bright spots on the horizon. School district collaboration is a growing trend in American education. The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) recently established a chapter for regional and intermediate educational service agencies that marks one of the few expanding administrative areas. A recent study of school administrators in St. Louis area from 1968-1976 (Lesser, 1978) found that the numbers and percentage of women administrators has increased. More detailed findings indicated that increases for men exceeded those for women, so the results are a mixed bag of good and not-so-good news. Moreover, new women administrators were located in support services and personnel areas, while men consistently advanced into decision-making and power positions.

In summary, shifting forces and financial supports in today's educational enterprise now offset, if not cancel any gains made by women preparing for access and entry into administrative positions. Furthermore, subtle and not-so-subtle forces continue to deny the acceptance of women as administrators. An examination of this issue, and the federal efforts to combat sexism suggests further constraints for prospective women administrators.

IV. The Sexism Standoff

The shrinking demand for educational administrators and the increasing supply of qualified women produces added frustrations for prospective women administrators. There are many positive factors that provide some comfort to women, however. The enactment of the Women's Equity Act, increased federal funds for research, increased monitoring of sex segregation in the schools, and increased and heightened awareness of sexism in American education all contribute toward a greater understanding of the problems confronted by women in a sexist-oriented society. These areas provide some "good news", or at least some comforting reassurance that the "problem" is being studied or serviced in some fashion.

Projects funded by Women's Equity since 1975 have produced a wealth of training programs, curricula and resource materials. These will produce long and short-term benefits for women in educational administration. Perhaps more than any other federally-sponsored project of this size, the Women's Equity office has had the foresight, if not the mandate, to include a dissemination and diffusion strategy from its inception. This strategy maximizes the impact of each project in addition to providing support and technical assistance to project staff. A comprehensive communication network, resource center, and information clearinghouse are included for this purpose. This design is an excellent indication that the Women's Equity staff has indeed "gotten its act together."

There is more "good news" on the federal level. The National Institute of Education identified "equity" as one of the Institute's two central missions and a recent program announcement concentrates $500,000. to support research on issues related to women's equity.

Several excellent, highly readable and eminently practical studies that pinpoint the major frustrations and strategies employed by prospective women administrators are now available from N.I.E. Doris Timpano's NIE-sponsored study Sex Discrimination in the Selection of School District Administrators: What Can Be Done? is one such example. Prospective women administrators, researchers, and policy-makers can all look forward to more NIE-sponsored materials that will address the complexity of this issue in a realistic, constructive manner. There are several other recent studies that focus on some of the particular problems facing prospective women administrators.

Paddock's recent (1978) federally-sponsored study examined career patterns and attitudes of female administrators. Results showed that women's career patterns have greater similarity, than dissimilarity with male career patterns. More importantly, the greatest dissimilarities occurred in personal and family roles and issues, not in areas of professional expertise or administrative skills. This finding should be particularly useful to employers such as school boards who may harbor uncertainties about women's ability "to do the job." Surprisingly, the ages, professional training and career milestones for women respondents in the Paddock study were not as disparate as one might imagine given the small number of women administrators. Women reach the superintendency barely thirteen months after men; complete their doctorates seven years later than men and obtain their first administrative position only seven months after a male superintendent. A critical factor for women in Paddock's sample was career interruptions for child-bearing. As we know, men rarely interrupt their careers and benefit from continuous career momentum.

An interesting difference between male and female administrators

is that men finance much of their graduate training through GI benefits. A national sample of male superintendents showed that 73.5% received benefits for their masters degree, and 38.7% received benefits for their doctorates. In addition, 32.8% received some kind of fellowship for their doctoral work. Less than 10% reported borrowing money or using savings to finance graduate study (Kneivich, 1971). Although this data has yet to be collected for women, it is safe to say that women finance their doctorates themselves since so few are eligible for GI benefits.

The effect of Women's Equity-produced materials and research studies is long-term and incremental at best. Women's groups continue to press for more rapid and immediate remedies and tangible results. Increased pressure by women's groups has forced greater responsiveness by the Office of Civil Rights to equity complaints. The number of Title IX complaints and cases has increased steadily over the last two years producing pressure points in state, local, and higher education institutions across the United States. Statistics indicate that women, either separately or jointly, are no longer fearful of filing equity complaints. Yet these individual or group cases are not enough, for they offer little remedy beyond the separate cases. Two current legal actions may have a more profound impact on the overall problem of diminished opportunities for women and other minority applicants. The current counter-suit by Sears Roebuck Co. against the Office of Civil Rights and a suit against the discriminatory effect of veterans preference in Massachusetts now before the Supreme Court, may open new frontiers in equity employment cases. The Sears case alleges that in effect the federal government created the economic and social conditions that perpetuate the preponderance of white males in leadership/administrative

positions through its encouragement and support of veterans preference and the repeal of mandatory retirement laws. The Massachusetts case is a direct challenge to the widely-accepted practice and policy of preferential treatment for veterans. The outcome of these cases may force federal policy-makers to adopt new measures for resolving inequities against women and other minorities wrought by past practices and policies.

These materials and active efforts do provide women, and men, with evidence of federal concern for the problem of sex segregation in school leadership. Given the decreasing number of women administrators, however, one is led to speculate whether Women's Equity and related efforts have actually produced a backlash against prospective women administrators. For in spite of Title IX, Women's Equity, and Executive Order 11246, sexism remains a dominant characteristic of American education. Print materials and statements that systematically exclude or deny the possibility of women in positions of leadership are still prevalent, despite heightened levels of awareness and interest in equity issues. For example, a recent speaker at the National Association of Secondary School Principals convention outlined several prerequisites for a successful principal. These include being"good looking, strong, and muscular."
AASA/NSBA (National School Boards Association) developed materials on the selection of a school superintendent use the masculine pronoun "he" to refer to prospective candidates.[14] Another AASA/NSBA booklet does mention women, but only as the superintendent's wife! In that context she is viewed as the one who "can make or break the superintendent" ... and as a potential troublemaker "by playing too many roles in the community." Rather, the report suggests, "she may aid the superintendent by staying at home, properly raising the family, and providing a

secure refuge for her husband."[15] These materials, published in 1962 are clearly obsolete but unfortunately these booklets have never been revised. The materials remain on bookshelves and in libraries, and continue to perpetuate male dominance, if not supremecy, in school administration.

One of the best kept secrets associated with the enactment of the Women's Equity Act of 1974 was a Congressional mandate directing the Commissioner of Education to "conduct a national comprehensive review of sex discrimination" and, among other things, "to identify discriminatory employment practices which have limited women's opportunities."[16] Accordingly, a contract was awarded and a 580 page, 2 volume report was prepared and submitted to the National Center for Educational Statistics in April, 1976. It appears that NCES chose to retain the document in its present unpublished form since it can only be obtained from the ERIC document reproduction system. The report itself is a comprehensive review of major recent historical and scientific studies, articles, legislation, court decisions, documents, and research that address issues related to the hiring and promotion of women in elementary, secondary, and higher education.[17] Kane's analysis focuses on personal, professional and discriminatory factors, rather than economic or societal constraints. She concludes:

1. Long-established employment practices of educational institutions have served as barriers to the appointment and particularly, promotion of women on an equal basis with men at all levels of education.

2. Women performing the same tasks with the same qualifications as men do not receive commensurate salaries at any level; throughout educational institutions women are provided inequitable fringe benefits.

3. The pool of available women is sufficient in numbers, training, and experience to fill more positions, and more responsible positions, than they currently hold.

> 4. Traditional life and work patterns, and psychological barriers to women's full participation in the educational job market -- though they do exist -- do not appear by themselves sufficiently inhibiting to explain women's comparative lack of progress in the field of education.[18]

Kane identified several critical factors that prevent women from moving into administrative positions. The primary cause, she states is "a male dominated, closed loop at the decision-making level, and qualifications for administrative positions that are often not job-related.[19] Furthermore, Kane asserts that personal issues, alleged to be major constraints for prospective women administrators are simply over-stated since there are now higher percentages of unmarried women in education -- currently as high as 52% in higher education.[20]

As the level of awareness and federal and state monitoring of these practices and policies increase, more subtle forms of sexist and discriminatory treatments are emerging. Kane's work reinforces the pervasive effects of entrenched sexist policies and practices in educational administration. William Ryan documented the expertise of the American educational system in "blaming-the-victim." In similar fashion, Pottker and Fishel (1977) applied Irving Goffman's analysis of an individual's adaptation to failure known as "cooling the mark" to describe the "systematic, ingenious and sometimes unconscious acts of the schools to relegate girls and women to subordinate positions in education."[21] Goffman's so-called "mark" is the loser in a con-game who must be conditioned to quietly accept the responsibility for his/her loss without complaint or action against the operator of "the game."

The Cottrell and Hughes (1978) Utah study is an interesting application of the blame-the-victim syndrome to women's current attempts to achieve equality in educational administration.[22] In the

Cottrell study of Utah school administrators, respondents cited women's "lack of initiative or low aspirations" as a major reason for the low number of women in educational administration. This explanation very neatly transfers the responsibility and blame from Utah administrators and decision-makers to women's shoulders.

David Tyack notes that in the mid-nineteenth century women were publicly applauded for their decision to stay in the classroom and not advance into administration. In 1841 the Boston School Committee commended women teachers for being unambitious, frugal, and filial and

> less intent on scheming for future honors or emoluments than men. As a class they never look forward, as young men almost always do, to a period of emancipation from parental control. [23]

At least the Boston School Committee publicly revealed their feelings and attitudes.

School administrators and researchers are rarely as open about their biases and prejudices although their intents and purposes are manifest in their actions. One example of this mis-placed, masked bias, masquerading as inadequate research, is Stephen Krchniak's (1977) study of 242 Illinois women teachers certified and credentialled for administrative positions, but according to the Illinois Department of Education, not employed in an administrative position. Krchniak sought to identify the variables associated with the low incidence of women in educational administration in the state. A profile of his respondents revealed a 50 year old married woman with no children left at home, who teaches in an elementary school in the community in which she resides. This typical respondent has a masters degree and holds a general supervisory certificate. Krchniak examined issues such as career aspirations, position-seeking assertiveness, personal and situational constraints. He found that

61% (148) of the women were not interested in administration, 26% (63) were moderately interested, and only 13% (31) respondents were extremely interested in administration.[24] Moreover, 86% (209) of the women reported making no or hardly any effort to obtain an administrative position, 11% (27) had made a moderate effort, and only 3% (6) made an "all out effort" to obtain an administrative position.[25] Taken at face value, Krchniak's findings are cause for concern, if not despair. Upon closer scrutiny, however, a serious researcher of the issue quickly realizes that Krchniak's "pool" of respondents is atypical when compared with male and female patterns of career development and advancement in educational administration. An American Association of School Administrators (AASA) sponsored study conducted by Knezevich in 1971 produced a profile of male superintendents which showed that men had obtained their first administrative position at 30, had completed a doctorate at age 33½ and had a mean age of 48.[26] Paddock's (1978) profile of women administrators cited earlier shows very little difference. These women obtained their first administrative position at 31, completed their doctorate by age 40, and had a mean age of 49.[27] Therefore, viewed within the context of Paddock's and Knezevich's findings, Krchniak's findings have limited, if any, significance and are an unfair indictment on women who have chosen to remain in the classroom. To generalize from these findings is a cruel twist in the "blame-the-victim" syndrome.

Another insidious manifestation of the syndrome can be found in counseling programs that employ strategies which subtley "blame-the-victim" for failing to obtain their career goals. A recent NIE report reviews government efforts to increase the number of women in non-traditional careers.[28] The report urges counselors to utilize remediation strategies to help women acquire needed skills, develop their

latent career aspirations, and finally, identify and combat discrimination. This last "strategy" is particularly insidious for it lays the blame and responsibility for combating discrimination on women, not employers who perpetuate discriminatory policies and practices that block women's career advancement. Thus, as these studies indicate, the current "blame-the-victim" syndrome revisited on women, is a powerful force that not only put women in a defensive position against the pervasive elements of sexism in American education, but constitutes one of the major constraints facing prospective women administrators.

The sexism standoff is particularly tragic today because women, with federal assistance, societal pressure, and personal and career development, are systematically overcoming traditional barriers to their access and entry into administration. However, as the research and numbers show, women's increased "readiness" for administration alone cannot break down the barriers to their acceptance into school administration. A closer look at Women's Equity as an "intervention" highlights some reasons for the sexism standoff or stalemate. Furthermore, this examination suggests some ways that federal officials can revise current efforts to more effectively counteract the system constraints women now face.

V. Examining Women's Equity as an Intervention

Federal mandates and financial support are the major influences on American education despite patterns of local autonomy and Constitutional state responsibility for education. Federal interventions in the local education enterprise began in the early twentieth century when recruitment for World War I soldiers revealed high rates of adult illiteracy. Mammoth amounts of federal support for education emanating from the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 molded the educational system of the sixties and seventies, and continues to influence American education in the 1980's. Many of the federal funding categories focused on enhancing classroom practices and programs, or alleviating inadequate training or supplies of qualified personnel. A brief review of some of these interventions pinpoints major differences in the Women's Equity approach to "intervention" and its ultimate impact on promoting access, entry and acceptance for prospective women administrators.

The federal government's response to national manpower needs in the sixties provides an interesting example of a federal intervention effort. In 1968 Congress determined there was a limited supply of qualified professional personnel in vocational education and attached a training component for vocational education personnel to the Higher Education Act of 1965. The purpose and intent of this amendment, Section 552 of Part F, was stated in the following manner:

> .....in order to meet the needs of the states for qualified vocational education personnel such as teacher educators, administrators, supervisors, etc., ..the Commissioner of Education shall make available leadership development activities... 29

These activities included specific eligibility and employability requirements for potential participants. Stipends for both participants and their dependents, and for institutions of higher education providing the training were included. Although funds to training institutions were limited to a maximum of $3,500 per person per academic year, stipends to individual participants appear to be flexible. These stipends were termed "subsistence expenses for participants and their dependents according to the prevailing practice in federal support programs." Three main criteria governed the selection of participants for this program:

1. persons selected must have had not less than two years of experience in vocational education;
2. persons receiving an award were to be reasonably assured of continued employment in vocational education;
3. persons selected were recommended by their employer as having leadership potential. [30]

The elements of this training program/intervention -- financial support, sponsorship, and implied promotional opportunity, indicate strong federal and professional commitment to achieving the purpose of the federal intervention and acceptance of the "trainee" into the profession. This effort bears little resemblance to the limited approach or commitment to educational leadership for women in the Women's Equity Act. These program elements are precisely the kinds of needs and concerns expressed by participants in the Boston University training module since they represent direct points of access, support, entry and acceptance so important to aspiring women administrators.

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) funded under the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) in 1967, is another example of a

federal intervention effort that addressed a critical deficiency in the educational system. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 gave birth to the classroom teacher aide. Low-income, minority members of predominantly urban and rural communities quickly filled these jobs since most of the positions were located in their own communities and because the positions offered a new option for people without a college degree. However, these people soon became concentrated on this bottom rung of the career ladder and had little hope of advancing into a professional position. This context, and the belief that schools, particularly in urban areas, would benefit from a better ethnic, cultural, and socio-economic balance between teacher and learner, provided the impetus for the COP program. Moreover, program developers recognized that a dedicated and enthusiastic pool of experienced teacher aides was readily available for career advancement. Simply stated, COP provided funds for teacher aides to become classroom teachers. In spite of the on-coming teacher surplus of the early seventies, school systems were very willing to hire COP graduates since they already had several years of classroom experience, plus the added bonus of work with urban, minority students. In its seven year existence, almost 15,000 participants were trained in the COP program at 272 of the country's 2660 institutions of higher education. Total costs per person averaged $8630.[31] This program included elements that were very similar to the vocational education intervention cited earlier -- financial support for both trainee and trainors, and liklihood of immediate employment.

These two examples of intervention efforts demonstrate the capacity of the federal government to respond to national educational needs in

a timely, purposeful, and systematic manner. Once the national need and purpose were defined, the government could respond, if it was willing or interested. These are not the only examples of federal training interventions, however. The federal government awards fellowships for public service, and for academic career preparation in areas that are "of importance to the national interest as determined by the Commissioner of Education" or that "address a significant, continuing need in the public service as determined by the Commissioner of Education."[32] The US Commissioner of Education, then, has extensive discretionary power in identifying national educational needs, marshalling a variety of resources to address the problem, and transforming needs into specific short or long-term interventions.

The limited resources and the weak approach inherent in the Women's Equity Act hardly acknowledge the pervasive elements and consequences of sexism in American education. Admittedly the training materials developed under Women's Equity funds such as the Boston University module have not yet had sufficient use to impact upon the complex problems associated with increasing the number of women educational administrators. But longevity or impact of use are not the real issue here, for in most cases, the intervention is misdirected. For those that will guarantee change in the status quo, are not the women participants at all, they are the decision-makers, both male and female, who say "yea" or "nay" when presented with qualified women candidates. Few equity projects have this focus or goal.[33]

Quality materials alone, whether Women's Equity-developed or otherwise, are not enough to reasonably insure a successful intervention. A chronic dilemma of federally-funded projects is the brief life-span and geographic impact of new materials. Until recently,

knowledge or use of such materials has been haphazard at best. Projects were funded, materials were developed and once the funding cycle was completed the federal agency had little interest in the product or project. The Women's Equity office, on the other hand, is to be commended for promoting the dissemination of project-sponsored materials. An effective dissemination strategy, however, includes four levels of activity:

1. Spread: a one way casting out of knowledge in all forms; data, products, materials

2. Exchange: the two or multi-way flow of information, products, ideas and materials relating to expressed needs and problems.

3. Choice: the facilitation of rational consideration and selection among ideas, materials and research and development outcomes.

4. Implementation: the facilitation of adoption, installation and the on-going utilization of improvements. [34]

With such limited resources from the Congress, Women's Equity dissemination activities are restricted to Level 1 activities. Thus, unless the federal government provides financial incentives for local, state or higher education institutions to utilize these materials or funds program developers to demonstrate and facilitate the adoption of the materials, then the long-term impact of these Women's Equity materials will be minimal. With little, if any, clout behind Title IX efforts with respect to promoting women administrators, and with no funds to encourage employers to utilize the materials, the Women's Equity intervention has little liklihood for truly affecting change in the status quo in educational administration. The deficiency of the intervention, then, becomes a further constraint rather than a remedy for prospective women administrators.

Conclusion

Women's Equity has laid the foundation and continues to provide support for activities that increase access and opportunity for prospective women administrators. However, the shifting financial picture in education limits the demand for an expanding supply of women candidates for administrative positions. Moreover, the pervasive effects of sexism in American education manifest in the subtle and direct exclusion of women from administration by thought, word, or action undermines and overshadows any advances by Women's Equity or individual women. In truth, Women's Equity is an insufficient remedy or intervention for the severe ailment known as sexism. The inherent deficiency of the Women's Equity legislation and the small program budget are major factors that contribute rather than remedy the constraints facing prospective women administrators. This conflicting scenario is cause for serious concern by researchers, policy-makers and prospective women administrators.

Increased reliance on federal funds for new program initiatives by state and local education agencies provides Congress and federal agencies with an excellent opportunity to remedy some of the constraints. Closer monitoring of staffing patterns for federally-financed projects will guarantee that the upward mobility of women and minorities, particularly those in soft-money areas, will not be blocked. Moreover, federal agencies can strongly encourage contractors and state and local educational agencies to retain, transfer or re-train women and minorities for new administrative positions. Thus, the federal government can take steps to remedy decreased opportunities for women, if it so desires and directs.

Research on this topic would be incomplete if it failed to suggest avenues for further research and action. It is particularly useful to note some of those issues here and now, since NIE has recently identi-

fied "equity" as a focus for new research. One topic of interest and significance to prospective women administrators is the correlation between the hiring of women administrators and the number of women on local school boards. This is particularly significant because, since 1920, school boards have been predominantly male, between 85-90%. Other research topics might include the effect of Title IX and Executive Order 11246 on the employment of women administrators; or the effect of declining enrollments on the availability of administrative positions, or even new practices and policies to correct inconsistencies across data collected by the National Center for Educational Statistics, the National Education Association, the National Associate of Secondary School Principals and the American Association of School Administrators.

Commitment and action to resolve these constraints and to remedy the low representation of women on school boards, must be the shared responsibility of a variety of groups, individuals and governmental agencies. These actions and policies, however, must include elements that truly address the depth of the problem. To promote access, opportunity and entry without addressing the acceptance of women into administration has only served to produce the current dilemma for prospective women administrators. Moreover, parents, policy-makers, teachers and all segments of the educational enterprise must join with women administrators in their concern for the long-term effect of the increasing homogeneity of the administration of American public education.

ENDNOTES

[1] See Cecilia M. DiBella, "The Role of the State Education Agency In Educational Change : A Case Study of In-Service Teacher Education in Rhode Island," for an analysis of the short and long-term impact of a federally funded teacher center grant in the administration and service delivery of in-service teacher education by the Rhode Island Department of Education.

[2] U.S. Office of Education, First Annual Report, Women's Educational Equity, September 30, 1976, p.5.

[3] Ibid, p.12.

[4] U.S. Office of Education, Second Annual Report, Women's Educational Equity, September 30, 1977, p.2.

[5] Ibid, p.8.

[6] One should be aware of the difference between "equity" and "equality". The American College Dictionary defines "equity" as fairness or impartiality, whereas "equality" is defined as being equal.

[7] The two major professional associations for educational administrators, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) have issued policy statements and made decisions in support of women. AASA, which recently elected its first woman to the executive committee, established an executive internship program for aspiring women superintendents. In 1975, NASSP adopted a resolution to "promote women as educational administrators and to encourage qualified women to prepare for, and accept the challenges of an executive, administrative position for which they have the interests, ability, and potential." As the following tables indicate, these actions have yet to show a positive influence on the status of women in educational administration.

[8] Inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the collection of data on women administrators is a difficult problem confronting researchers. The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) and professional associations, AASA, NASSP and NEA show wide variations in the numbers of women administrators. Moreover, NCES only began collecting M/F breakdowns in 1975 and their data is fragmentary and unreliable as evidenced by the 1977 data in Table 2 in which nine states (18%) failed to include M/F breakdowns for school administrators.

[9] Jacqueline P. Clement, Cecilia M. DiBella and Sheila Tobins, Women in Educational Leadership, p.4.

[10] National Center for Education Statistics, Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Students, 1965 and 1975.

[11] Paul Berman and Milbrey McLaughlin, "The Management of Decline: Problems, Opportunities, and Research Questions," p.314.

[12] William F. Keough, "Enrollment Decline: The Dilemma from the Superintendent's Chair," p.348.

[13] ESEA Title V Aid To Strengthen State Departments of Education, now known as Title IV B.

[14]AASA/NSBA, On Selecting a Superintendent.

[15]AASA/NSBA, To the Beginning Superintendent, p.28.

[16]Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974, Section 408 (b), 4.

[17]Roslyn D. Kane, Sex Discrimination in Education: A Study of Employment Practices Affecting Professional Personnel, Vol. I, Study Report, Vol. II, Annotated Bibliography, 1976.

[18]Ibid, p.I-1.

[19]Ibid, p.I-6.

[20]Ibid, p.I-9.

[21]Janice Pottker and Andrew Fishel (eds.) Sex Bias in the Schools: The Research Evidence.

[22]Milford C. Cottrell and Donald L. Hughes, Utah Women Educators in School Administration.

[23]David B. Tyack, The One Best System, p.60.

[24]Stefan P. Krchniak, "Entry into School Administration by Women in Illinois: Facts and Dynamics," p.30-31.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Stephen J. Knezvich, The American School Superintendent.

[27]Susan Paddock, Careers in Educational Administration: Are Women The Exception?

[28]Walter Smith, Caryl Smith, and Kala Strup. Counseling Women for Non-Traditional Careers.

[29]Higher Education Act of 1965, Part F, Section 552.

[30]Ibid.

[31]George R. Kaplan, From Aide to Teacher, p.82.

[32]Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IX, Part B, C, & D.

[33]A notable exception is the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) Women's Equity grant which has multiple target groups: prospective men and women administrators, higher education faculty and administrators, and school district administrators and school committee members.

[34]Interstate Project on Dissemination, Dissemination Analysis Group (DAG) Report, 1976.

Bibliography

Abramowitz, Susan and Rosenfeld, Stuart. (ed). Declining Enrollments: The Challenge of the Coming Decade. Washington, D.C. : National Institute of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

American Association of School Administrators. On Selecting a Superintendent of Schools. Washington, D.C. : American Association of School Administrators/National School Boards Association, 1962.

American Association of School Administrators. To The Beginning Superintendent. Washington, D.C. : American Association of School Administrators, 1962.

Clement, Jacqueline P. Sex Bias in School Leadership. Evanston : Integrated Education Associates, 1975.

Clement, Jacqueline P.; DiBella, Cecilia M., and Tobias, Sheila. Women in Educational Leadership. Washington, D.C., U.S. Office of Education, 1975.

Coffin, Gregory and Ekstom, Ruth B. Aspirations, Experiences, and Roadblocks to the Hiring of Women in Educational Administration. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Annual Meeting, New York, New York, April, 1977.

Cottrell, Milford C. and Hughes, Donald L. Utah Women Educators in School Administration. Bethesda, Maryland : ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 150 744.

Cunningham, Laverne L. Mid-Career Study for School Administrators : Programs and Problems. Oregon School Study Bulletin, 1976

DiBella, Cecilia M. "The Role of the State Education Agency in Educational Change : A Case Study of In-Service Teacher Education in Rhode Island". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1978.

Frankel, Martin and Harrison, Forrest W. Projections of Education Statistics 1965-66 to 1985-86. Washington, D.C. : National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Grambs, Jean Dresden, "Women and Administration : Confrontation or Accomodation?" Theory Into Practice, 15 (October, 1976) : 293-300.

Haczynski, Sharon L. Vocational Counseling Needs of Young Women as Perceived By Working Business and Professional Women. Menomonie, Wisconsin : Center for Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, 1978.

Hayes, Mabel E. "The Career Opportunities Program : A Model For Social and Institutional Change" Phi Delta Kappan, 60 (February, 1979) : 446-447.

Kane, Roslyn. Sex Discrimination in Education : A Study of Employment Practices Affecting Educational Personnel. Washington, D.C. : National Center for Educational Statistics, 1976.

Kaplan, George R. From Aide to Teacher : The Story of the Career Opportunities Program. Washington, D.C. : U.S. Office of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Kelsey, Frances W. Women in Educational Administration in New England. New England Coalition of Educational Leaders, 1978.

Knezevich, Stephen J. The American School Superintendent. Washington, D.C. : American Association of School Administrators, 1971.

Knezevich, Stephen J. Preparation for the American School Superintendency. Washington, D.C. : American Association of School Administrators, 1972.

Krchniak, Stefan P. Entry into School Administration by Women in Illinois : Facts and Dynamics. A Research Report Submitted to the Illionis Office of Education, 1977.

Lesser, Philip. The Participation of Women in Public School Administration. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada, March, 1978.

Levandowski, Barbara S. "Women in Education Administration : Where Do They Stand?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 61 (September, 1977) : 101-106.

National Center for Educational Statistics. Statistics of State School Systems. Washington, D.C. : U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970, 1975, 1976, 1977.

National Research Council. Summary Report of Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities. Washington, D.C. : National Academy of Sciences, 1978.

Neidig, Marilyn. "The Rise and Decline of Women Administrators." National Elementary Principal, 56 (November, 1976) : 53-54.

Niedermayer, Gretchen and Kramer, Vicki W. Women in Administrative Positions in Public Education : A Position Paper. Philadelphia : Recruitment and Leadership Training Institute, 1974.

Ortiz, Flora. The Hierarchical System of School Administration : The Contributions of Qualitative Research. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada, March, 1978.

Paddock, Susan. Careers in Educational Administration : Are Women the Exception? Eugene, Oregon : Center for Educational Policy and Management, 1978.

Pottker, Janice and Fischel, Andrew (eds.). Sex Bias in the Schools : The Research Evidence. Cranbury, New Jersey : Associated University Press, 1977.

Sexton, Patricia. Women in Education. Bloomington, Indiana : Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1976.

Silver, Paula F. Women in Educational Leadership : A Trend Discussion, Columbus, Ohio : University Council for Educational Administration, 1976.

Smith, Walter; Smith Caryl; and Strop, Kala. Counseling Women for Nontraditional Careers. Ann Arbor : ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services, 1977.

Stockard, Jean. Public Prejudice Against Women School Administrators : Fact or Fiction? Eugene, Oregon : Center for Educational Policy and Management, 1977.

Tyack, David B. The One Best System. Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University Press, 1977.